

Proposal Reviews

#54: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Initial Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

#1

#2

#3

#4

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 54

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$5748112**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

Although the technical review panel rated the proposal as adequate, they did so based on the lack of a private cost-share. They identified no technical concerns, noting that the project was poised to proceed. The regional review panel gave the project a high rating, noting that the project was very important to overall restoration efforts in Butte Creek. As such, the project is part of a regionally significant, large-scale restoration effort. The project is for next-phase funding of a CALFED-funded project and will complement other restoration actions already completed or underway in the Butte Creek watershed. Previous phases showed significant cost share. The Selection Panel reviewed the rating summary and determined that the cost-share concern raised by the technical review panel should not deter funding this proposal. The Selection Panel recommended funding as proposed.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Proposal Number: 54

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	This project is poised to proceed. It would be ranked higher if the proposal budget included a private cost-share.
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

The projects are located in Butte Creek, where they can help fall- and late-fall-run salmon and steelhead trout, and the largest remaining runs of spring-run Chinook Salmon in the central valley. The fish ladders and exclusion barriers proposed will contribute to species survival by incrementally reducing delay of adult migration and by increasing survival of juveniles.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

Not a fish screen.

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated? Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

This project has well-established local involvement and support. It appears to be readily implementable. It complements other Butte Creek efforts in the upper watershed.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Costs appear somewhat high in light of projects relative simplicity. Breakdown of individual project costs not provided in the proposal

5. **Partnerships/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

Prior funding from AFRP, BOR, Tracy Mitigation, CALFED, SNWR. Some private cost-share would be appropriate.

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Regional review ranked the project high because it integrates with other area efforts, and has great potential to enhance passage of listed anadromous runs. Attention to O&M and management agreements was recommended.

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No negative comments noted.

Miscellaneous comments:

In the event that sufficient funds aren't available, the proposal has identified sub-projects relative importance. Project would be rated more highly if private cost-share were included.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 54

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This project is very important to overall restoration efforts in Butte Creek. It should greatly enhance fish passage while not jeopardizing existing operations.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

This is a request for 3rd phase, construction funding. PS&E to be completed by 12-31-01 with prior funding. Construction plans to be reviewed and approved by DWR, NMFS, CDFG and Stakeholders. The project is widely supported.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

It will upgrade and reconstruct five (5) existing structures with new fish ladders and improve water control structures which will help restore largest remaining runs of spring-run Chinook Salmon in the central valley. Consistent with PSP Sacramento region priorities Number 1, 2, 3 and 6.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

The project is closely linked to the overall Ecosystem Restoration Program for the Butte Creek Watershed. This project complements the many completed restoration actions on the upper watershed of Butte Creek to improve fish passage.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Over 3-years of planning have taken place involving California Waterfowl Association, TNC, R.D. 1004, private landowners, state and federal agencies.

Other Comments:

Recommend completion of the management agreement for Sanborn Slough and completion of a management agreement for flow management through the Butte Sink. O&M of the proposed structures should be resolved.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 54

New Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

CALFED # 99-B02, USBR # 99-FC-20-0055, Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow-Through System.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

USBR # 99-FC-20-0055, Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II - Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Analysis for Butte Sink Structural Modifications and Flow-Through System.

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

-Yes No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Status, No! Progress, Yes. Accomplishments, N/A.

Financial Status of the 99-B02 currently shows \$750,000 obligated towards the CALFED portion and \$250,000 obligated towards the CVPIA portion of the USBR Agreement 99-FC-20-0055. Amount stated by applicant as income (\$531,850.58) may reflect actual expenditures from the CALFED portion of the Agreement at the time of proposal submission

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Reporting, Yes! Record keeping, N/A. Financial management, N/A.

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Yes, current Agreement expected completion date will be June 30, 2002.

Other Comments:

Other comments: Ducks Unlimited, Inc. has been able to enlist other fund sources to add to and maximize the work effort concerning the Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II. They are very well organized and forthcoming with all of the paper work and reports required under the current Agreement.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 54

New Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

01-N54; Lower Butte Creek Project: Phase III Facilitation/Coordination and Construction of Three Fish Passage Modification to Sutter Bypass West Side Water Control Structures, ERP.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

DU did not list in their 2002 PSP additional project that have received CALFED funding in the past, such as 97-N18 & 97-N19.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #3

New Proposal Number: 54

New Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

Gorrill Ranch Fish Screen 96-M22

M&T/Parrott Pumping Station and Fish Screen 95-MO5

Rancho Esquon/Adams Fish Screen and Fish Ladder 96-M21

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Ducks Unlimited does an outstanding job on all projects where I have been involved.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #4

New Proposal Number: 54

New Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase III- Butte Creek, Drumheller Exclusion Barrier Final Engineering, Permitting and Construction, 11332-9-J006 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Butte Sink/Sutter Bypass Stakeholder Coordination/Facilitation, 11332-9-J135 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass East-West Diversion Dam Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J122 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #3 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J122 Lower Butte Creek Project, Phase II- Butte Creek, Sutter Bypass Weir #5 Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review, 11332-9-J136 Sutter Bypass Eastside, 11332-0-J004 Lower Butte Creek, Butte Slough Phase II - Preliminary File, 11332-0-J003

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Extremely well managed. Ducks Unlimited, Olen Zirkle is the strongest project manager that I have ever worked with. He is managing a very complex effort with many funding sources and project components. DU is entering the final construction phases of The Lower Butte Creek Project which involves oversight of all the construction aspects. DU has done an excellent job to date managing engineering firms on the many past and ongoing construction projects in the project boundaries.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 54

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 54

Applicant Organization: Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Proposal Title: Butte Sink Water Control Structure Modifications - Phase III Construction

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

Yes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

Yes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: